

# Defense Language Program



## Defense Language Transformation Roadmap

***Gail H. McGinn***  
***Deputy Under Secretary of Defense***  
***(Plans)***



# ***Why Transform?***

- **Language is a strategic asset**
  - A capability
- **The management of our language capability is based on a Cold War model**
- **New operational demands require a new approach**
- **The language need is big ... and c**
  - “tweaking” the edges won’t he





# ***DoD Should Have...***

## ***From the Strategic Planning Guidance for FY2006-2011***

- **Create foundational language and cultural expertise in the officer, civilian and enlisted ranks for both active and reserve components**
- **Create the capacity to surge language and cultural resources beyond these foundational and in-house capabilities**
- **Establish a cadre of language professionals possessing a level 3/3/3 ability**
- **Establish a process to track the accession, separation and promotion rates of linguist and Foreign Area Officers**

***-- Roadmap due to DEPSECDEF by 9/30/04.***

To assist in meeting these goals, transformation of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in terms of qualitative improvements to achieve the desired outcome, and expanded roles in providing language support will be required.



# ***Studies Inform Our Efforts***

- **Dr. Jerome Smith report on the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center**
- **SAIC five study areas:**
  - **Developing language and regional knowledge**
  - **Management of Foreign Area Officers**
  - **Management of language professionals**
  - **Current requirements processes -- Options for embedding language in/or providing language ability to operational units**
  - **Language management at COCOMs**
- **Defense Language Institute Transformation White Paper**
- **Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps**
- **National Flagship Language Initiative**

***A Defense Language Transformation Team was established to research issues, develop proposals, and inform policy - the Roadmap reflects their work.***



# ***Lessons Learned***

## ***OIF***

- **Undefined/improbable language need unmet by traditional means - organic or contractor**
- **No focus in solving language need**
- **Forecast of TS/SCI, 3/3/3, v. Requirement & Availability?**
- **Prohibitive age restrictions (IRR)**
- **Prohibitive hiring policy on non-US citizens**

## ***OEF***

- **Linguists: “Immediate need; Insufficient numbers”**

*Commander, USSOCOM; May 2003*



# ***Army Lessons Learned***

## ***OIF Examples***

- **Shortage of foreign language skills arose in all operations reviewed. Contract/foreign linguists used with resultant security and OPSEC risks. Shortages of culturally aware linguists impacts on the effectiveness of Information Operations, Psychological Operations, Civil Affairs. HUMINT dramatically impacted by poor language skills.**
- **101<sup>st</sup> HUMINT folks effective, but too few and needed additional linguist support.**
- **Interpreters needed to work with Arab media to get our message out, has not happened thus far.**
- **Linguist need in MEDCAP.**
- **4<sup>th</sup> ID took 100 Russian linguists to Iraq, no Arabic capability.**

*— Center for Army Lessons Learned extracts, OEF-TTP 02-08*



# ***Selected Findings***

- **DoD does not have an effective foreign language oversight process.**
- **DoD does not have a comprehensive and integrated strategy for language and regional expertise.**
- **DoD has not completed a zero-based review of requirements for language and cultural expertise. No capabilities based review.**
- **The Combatant Commands lack a common and systemically applied process for requirements determination.**
- **Without a system for determining language and regional expertise capability needs, Combatant Commands underestimate**



## ***Selected Findings con***

- **With only a few exceptions, the Combatant Commands:**
  - Have not established Command Language Programs or a language proponent
  - Do not explicitly consider language and regional expertise in operational planning
- **No mechanism exists to assess DoD or Combatant Command language readiness.**
- **Current practices for contracting civilian linguist support have created significant problems, which degrade operational effectiveness and security.**





# ***Selected Findings con***

- **While Defense Agencies and Service have established procedures for forecasting critical languages, there is no process being used or criteria available for standardizing DoD critical languages list to support planning.**
- **FAO skills have not been traditionally perceived as critical war fighting skills**
  - Military Departments have adopted different approaches to meet the Services FAO program requirements, but not all of the Services' programs fulfill the establish and future requirements.
  - Combatant Commands have undocumented requirements for FAO coded-billets that have not been recoded on Joint Manning Documents due to concerns that they will go unfilled.
  - Current practice of filling language and FAO coded billets with non-qualified



# ***Assumptions***

- **Conflict against enemies speaking less-commonly-taught languages, and thus the need for foreign language capability, will not abate. Robust foreign language and foreign area expertise are critical to sustaining coalitions, pursuing regional stability, and conducting multi-national missions especially in post-conflict and other than combat, security, humanitarian, nation-building and stability operations.**
- **Changes in the international security environment and in the nature of threats to US national security have increased the range of potential conflict zones and expanded the number of likely coalition partners with whom US forces will work, all of which reinforces the critical need for Defense Language Transformation.**
- **Establishing a new “global footprint” for DoD, and transitioning to a more expeditionary force, will bring with it increased requirements for language and regional knowledge to work with new coalition partners in a wide variety of activities, often with little or no notice. This new approach to warfighting in the 21<sup>st</sup> century will require forces that have foreign language capabilities beyond those generally available in today’s force.**



# ***Current State and Desired Outcome***

## ***Goal 1 - Create foundational language and cultural***

### ***Current Situation***

Language and regional expertise have not been regarded as warfighting skills, and are therefore not incorporated into operational or contingency planning. As a result, there is no effort under the current "requirements" determination process to prepare for support of deployed forces. Language talent that may be resident in the force (active and reserve components, and civilian) is unknown and untapped. Language and cultural expertise are not valued as Defense core competencies.

### ***Desired Outcomes***

The Department needs the right number of language professionals with the right level of expertise in the right languages. The Department also needs a corps of language-enabled personnel capable of responding as needed in support of peacetime and wartime operations. We must develop an officer corps that understands and values the strategic asset inherent in regional expertise and language. Finally, language and foreign area education need to be incorporated into the officer Professional Military Education.



# ***Current State and Desired Outcomes Con't***

## ***Goal 2 - Create the capacity to surge***

### ***Current Situation***

Emerging critical language requirements are not being met. Current contracting practices are insufficient to meet the demand.

### ***Desired Outcome***

The Department of Defense must have an ability to provide language and cultural expertise support to operational units on short notice.



# ***Current State and Desired Outcomes Con't***

## ***Goal 3 - Establish a cadre of language specialists possessing a level 3 ability***

### ***Current Situation***

Language skills are insufficient to meet the requirements of the changed security environment since the end of the Cold War. The technological revolution of the 1990's requires much greater language capability to process than the stereotyped activities of Cold War opponents.

### ***Desired Outcome***

The Department must determine the levels of proficiency required for tasks involving languages, and must develop career and training plans to get the right people to the correct proficiency. Some DoD specified tasks, particularly in Information Operations, may require level 3 or even higher and the programs to train personnel to achieve the higher levels must be developed and implemented.



# ***Current State and Desired Outcomes*** ***Con't***

## ***Goal 4 - Establish a process to track the accession, separation and promotion rates of language professionals and Foreign Area Officers***

### ***Current Situation***

FAO jobs are viewed as career ending in some service officer communities. Retention rates are lower among language professionals in some services, primarily due to poor linguist utilization.

### ***Desired Outcome***

Language professionals and Foreign Area Officers must be managed as strategic assets and Departmental oversight must track the management of these professionals.



# ***DLIFLC Transformation***

***To assist in meeting the goals set forth in the***

## ***Current Situation***

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center is an effective and responsive element of the Defense Language Program. However, no existing program for preparing to meet rapidly emerging language requirements, outdated testing and curriculum, "student fill" procedures are not conducive to meeting emerging needs.

## ***Desired Outcome***

Transform the DLIFLC in terms of qualitative improvements. The DLIFLC must transform to graduate students at the highest ILR level possible from the basic courses, preferably 3/3/3, and to continue distributed foreign language education throughout the service members' career. The goal is for the service member to attain level 3/3/3 as soon as possible in their career, if not at graduation from DLIFLC. The DLIFLC must also be prepared to respond rapidly to emerging language-training requirements.



# ***Recommendations***

## ***Goal 1 - Create foundational language and culture***

- **Establish a Language Office within USD (P&R).**
- **Revise DoD Language Program Directive (DoDD 5160.41).**
- **Publish a DoD Instruction providing guidance for language program management.**
  
- **Develop doctrine/instructions for deliberately planned and contingency language support.**
- **Build a broader capabilities-based language requirement determination process.**
  
- **Develop a language readiness index.**
  
- **Standardize language and regional codes for employment across the DoD.**
- **Conduct a comprehensive screening of all military and civilian personnel.**
- **Revise current practices employed during the civilian job application process.**





# ***Recommendations***

## ***Goal 2 - Create the capacity to surge***

- **Expedite the staffing and publication of a language and regional expertise operational planning tool.**
- **Evaluate and expand the Army's 09L Individual Ready Reserve program.**
- **Develop and implement a Civilian Language Reserve Corps (CLRC).**
- **Implement familiarization training to be administered during the deployment cycle.**
- **Develop a Joint Service Language Corps (JSLC).**
- **Develop a plan for enhancing civilian language and regional expertise in the workforce.**
- **Improve contract language support.**
- **Establish a coherent and coordinated DoD multi-language technology**



# Recommendations

## ***Goal 3 - Establish a cadre of language specialist***

***possessing a level 3 ability***

- Identify missions that will require 3/3/3, determine the minimum number needed to provide the language services, implement training & utilization policies and programs, and establish personnel and mission databases and tracking procedures that will enable managers to monitor capabilities and program effectiveness.
- Set a DoD goal of ILR proficiency level 3/3/3 and implement training and career management plans to achieve and sustain this level.
- Implement an intensive full-time language program to produce a solidly proficient level 3 language professionals.
- Ensure availability of test for speaking at any level and for ILR skill level 3.



# ***Recommendations***

## ***Goal 4 - Establish a process to track the accession, separation and promotion rates of language professionals and Foreign Area Officers***

- **Manage language professionals to maximize the accession, development, sustainment, and employment of language skills.**
- **Develop and sustain a personnel system that maintains accurate data on all DoD personnel skilled in foreign languages and area expertise.**
- **Publish a revised DoD Directive to oversee the Services FAO Program, establish a standard metric and monitor FAO accession, retentions, and promotion rates.**
- **Publish a critical language list and update at least annually.**
- **Establish metrics (to include utilization and management, accession, promotion, retention, and any significant issues) and institute a process for**



# ***Recommendations***

## ***DLIFLC Transformation***

***Requirements for DLIFLC support of transformation to be considered at July meeting.....***



# ***The Next Steps***

- **Agreement on Assumptions, Current Situation, Desired Outcomes.**  
*(E-mail comments to me by 6/30/04)*
- **Full Roadmap Sent to Defense Language Action Panel (DLAP) for Action Officer Review and Comment.**
- **Next July DLSC Meeting, Consideration of Issues Identified in DLAP Review; discuss DLIFLC Transformation Plan.**
- **August DLSC, Review Revised Roadmap for Submission to Defense Leadership.**
- **September - Roadmap review by Defense Principals for Submission to DEPSECDEF by September 30.**